

An invariance principle for sums and record times of regularly varying stationary sequences

Bojan Basrak*

Hrvoje Planinić[†]

Philippe Soulier[‡]

September 5, 2016

Abstract

We prove a sequence of limiting results about weakly dependent stationary and regularly varying stochastic processes in discrete time. After deducing the limiting distribution for individual clusters of extremes, we present a new type of point process convergence theorem. It is designed to preserve the entire information about the temporal ordering of observations which is typically lost in the limit after time scaling. By going beyond the existing asymptotic theory, we are able to prove a new functional limit theorem. Its assumptions are satisfied by a wide class of applied time series models, for which standard limiting theory in the space D of càdlàg functions does not apply.

To describe the limit of partial sums in this more general setting, we use the space E of so-called decorated càdlàg functions. We also study the running maximum of partial sums for which a corresponding functional theorem can be still expressed in the familiar setting of space D .

We further apply our method to analyze record times in a sequence of dependent stationary observations, even when their marginal distribution is not necessarily regularly varying. Under certain restrictions on dependence among the observations, we show that the record times after scaling converge to a relatively simple compound scale invariant Poisson process.

Keywords: point process regular variation invariance principle functional limit theorem record times

*Department of Mathematics, University of Zagreb, Bijenička 30, Zagreb, Croatia

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of Zagreb, Bijenička 30, Zagreb, Croatia

[‡]Université Paris Ouest Nanterre, 92000 Nanterre, France

1 Introduction

Donsker-type functional limit theorems represent one of the key developments in probability theory. They express invariance principles for rescaled random walks of the form

$$S_{[nt]} = X_1 + \cdots + X_{[nt]}, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1.1)$$

Many extension of the original invariance principle exist, most notably allowing dependence between the steps X_i , or showing, like Skorohod did, that nongaussian limits are possible if the steps X_i have infinite variance. For a survey of invariance principles in the case of dependent variables in the domain of attraction of the gaussian law, we refer to [MPU06], see also [Bra07] for a thorough survey of mixing conditions. In the case of a nongaussian limit, the limit of the processes $(S_{[nt]})_{t \in [0,1]}$ is not a continuous process in general. Hence, the limiting theorems of this type are placed in the space of càdlàg functions denoted by $D([0, 1])$ under one of the Skorohod topologies. The topology denoted by J_1 is the most widely used (often implicitly) and suitable for i.i.d. steps, but over the years many theorems involving dependent steps have been shown using other Skorohod topologies. Even in the case of a simple m -dependent linear process from a regularly varying distribution, it is known that the limiting theorem cannot be shown in the standard J_1 topology, see Avram and Taqu [AT92]. Moreover, there are examples of such processes for which none of the Skorohod topologies work, see Section 4.

However, as we found out, for all those processes and many other stochastic models relevant in applications, random walks do converge, but their limit exists in an entirely different space. To describe the elements of such a space we use the concept of decorated càdlàg functions and denote it $E([0, 1])$, following Whitt [Whi02]. See Section 4. Presentation of this new type of limit theorems is the main goal of our article. For the statement of our main result see Theorem 4.5 in Section 4. As a related goal we also study the running maximum of the random walk $S_{[nt]}$ for which, due to monotonicity, the limiting theorem can still be expressed in the familiar space $D([0, 1])$.

Our main analytical tool is the limit theory for point processes in certain nonlocally compact space which is designed to preserve the order of the observations as we rescale time to interval $[0, 1]$ as in (1.1). Observe that due to this scaling, successive observations collapse in the limit to the same time instance. As an auxiliary result in this context, we prove in Section 2 a large deviations result of the type shown recently by [MW16] (cf. [HS10]) and offer an alternative probabilistic interpretation of these results. Using our setup we are able to extend certain point process limit theorems in [DH95] and [BKS12], see Section 3.

Additionally, our method allows for the analysis of records and record times in the sequence of dependent stationary observations X_i . By a classical result of Rényi, the number of records among first n iid observations from a continuous distribution grows logarithmically with n . Moreover it is known (see e.g. [Res87]) that record times rescaled by n tend to the so-called scale invariant Poisson process, which plays a fundamental role in several areas of probability, see [Arr98]. For a stationary sequence $(X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with an arbitrary

continuous marginal distribution, we show that the record times converge to a relatively simple compound Poisson process under certain restrictions on dependence. This form of the limit reflects the fact that for dependent sequences records tend to come in clusters, as one typically observes in many natural situations. This is the content of Section 5. Finally, proofs of certain technical auxiliary results are postponed to Section 6. In the rest of the introduction, we formally present the main ingredients of our model.

We now introduce our main assumptions and notation. Recall that a d -dimensional random vector $\mathbf{X}$ is regularly varying with index $\alpha > 0$ if there exists a random vector $\Theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{X}\| > x)} \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{X}\| > ux, \mathbf{X}/\|\mathbf{X}\| \in \cdot) \Rightarrow u^{-\alpha} \mathbb{P}(\Theta \in \cdot), \quad (1.2)$$

for every $u > 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Rightarrow$ denotes the weak convergence of measures. A time series $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is regularly varying if all the finite-dimensional vectors $(X_k, \dots, X_l)$, $k \leq l \in \mathbb{Z}$ are regularly varying, see [DH95] for instance. We will consider a strictly stationary regularly varying process $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. By regular variation of its marginal distribution, there exists a sequence $\{a_n\}$, $a_n \rightarrow \infty$, and a Radon measure μ on $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$ given by

$$\mu(dy) = p\alpha y^{-\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(y)dy + (1-p)\alpha(-y)^{-\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,0)}(y)dy \quad (1.3)$$

for some $p \in [0, 1]$, such that

$$n\mathbb{P}(X_0/a_n \in \cdot) \xrightarrow{v} \mu, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\xrightarrow{v}$ denotes vague convergence on $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$. In particular, for all $x > 0$,

$$n\mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n x) \rightarrow x^{-\alpha}. \quad (1.5)$$

According to [BS09], the regular variation of the stationary sequence $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is equivalent to the existence of the tail process $\{Y_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ which satisfies $\mathbb{P}(|Y_0| > y) = y^{-\alpha}$ for $y \geq 1$ and, as $x \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(\{x^{-1}X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \mid |X_0| > x) \xrightarrow{\text{fi.di.}} \{Y_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad (1.6)$$

where $\xrightarrow{\text{fi.di.}}$ denotes convergence of finite-dimensional distributions. Moreover, the so-called spectral tail process $\{\Theta_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, defined by $\Theta_n = Y_n/|Y_0|$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, turns out to be independent of $|Y_0|$ and satisfies

$$(\{|X_0|^{-1}X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \mid |X_0| > x) \xrightarrow{\text{fi.di.}} \{\Theta_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad (1.7)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Throughout the paper, we will assume in addition that the following condition, often referred to as the anticlustering or finite mean cluster length condition, holds.

Assumption 1.1. *There exists a sequence of integers $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/r_n = \infty$ and for every $u > 0$,*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \leq |i| \leq r_n} |X_i| > a_n u \mid |X_0| > a_n u\right) = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

There are many time series satisfying conditions above including several nonlinear models like stochastic volatility or GARCH (see [MW13, Section 4.4]) but traditionally best studied example in the family are regularly varying linear processes described below.

Example 1.2. Consider an infinite order moving average process $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with respect to a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with regularly varying distribution with index $\alpha > 0$. That is,

$$X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j Z_{t-j}$$

where $\{c_j, j \geq 0\}$ is a sequence of real numbers and there exists $\delta < \alpha \wedge 1$ such that

$$0 < \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |c_j|^\delta < \infty. \quad (1.9)$$

Under condition (1.9), the sequence $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is strictly stationary and regularly varying with tail index α ; see e.g. [HS08]. Moreover, using standard truncation techniques, it can be proved that Assumption 1.1 holds under the same conditions. Corresponding tail process $\{Y_t\}$ was computed in [MS10]. It can be described as follows: there exists an integer valued random variable N , independent of Y_0 such that

$$\mathbb{P}(N = n) = \frac{|c_n|^\alpha}{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |c_j|^\alpha}, \quad Y_t = \frac{c_{t+N}}{|c_N|} Y_0, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

2 Asymptotics of clusters

Let l_0 be the space of double-sided real sequences converging to zero at both ends, i.e. $l_0 = \{\mathbf{x} = \{x_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}\} : \lim_{|i| \rightarrow \infty} x_i = 0\}$. On l_0 consider the uniform norm

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |x_i|,$$

which makes l_0 into a separable Banach space. Indeed, l_0 is the closure of all finite double-sided rational sequences in the Banach space of all bounded double-sided real sequences. Define the shift operator θ on l_0 by $(\theta \mathbf{x})_i = x_{i+1}$ and introduce an equivalence relation $\sim$ on l_0 by letting $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y}$ if $\mathbf{y} = \theta^k \mathbf{x}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the sequel, we consider the quotient space

$$\tilde{l}_0 = l_0 / \sim,$$

and define a function $\tilde{d} : \tilde{l}_0 \times \tilde{l}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) := \inf\{\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'\|_\infty : \mathbf{x}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\} = \inf\{\|\theta^k \mathbf{x} - \theta^l \mathbf{y}\|_\infty : k, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

for all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \tilde{l}_0$, and all $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y} \in \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$. The proof of the following result can be found in Section 6.

Lemma 2.1. *The function $\tilde{d}$ is a metric which makes $\tilde{l}_0$ a separable and complete metric space.*

One can naturally embed the set $\cup_{d \geq 1} \mathbb{R}^d \cup l_0$ into $\tilde{l}_0$ by mapping $\mathbf{x} \in l_0$ to its equivalence class and an arbitrary finite sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ to the equivalence class of the sequence

$$(\dots, 0, 0, \mathbf{x}, 0, 0, \dots),$$

which adds zeros in front and after it.

Let $\{Z_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a sequence of random variables distributed as $\{Y_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ conditionally on the event $\{\sup_{i \leq -1} |Y_i| \leq 1\}$. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{L}(\{Z_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}) = \mathcal{L}\left(\{Y_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \mid \sup_{i \leq -1} |Y_i| \leq 1\right), \quad (2.1)$$

Observe that by (1.8), $|Y_n| \rightarrow 0$ with probability 1 as $|n| \rightarrow \infty$, see Proposition 4.2 in [BS09]. Therefore, $\{Z_n\}$ in (2.1) can be viewed as a random element in l_0 and $\tilde{l}_0$ in a natural way. In particular, the random variable

$$L_Z = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Z_j|$$

is a.s. finite and clearly, since $\mathbb{P}(|Y_0| > 1) = 1$, not smaller than 1. Due to regular variation and (1.8) one can show (see [BT16]) that for $v \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{P}(L_Z > v) = v^{-\alpha}. \quad (2.2)$$

One can also define a new sequence $\{Q_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in $\tilde{l}_0$ as the equivalence class of

$$Q_j = Z_j / L_Z, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.3)$$

Consider now a block of observations $(X_1, \dots, X_{r_n})$, conditionally on the event that $M_{r_n} > a_n u$. It turns out that the law of such a block has a limiting distribution and that L_Z and $\{Q_j\}$ are independent.

Theorem 2.2. *Under Assumption 1.1, for every $u > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\frac{X_1, \dots, X_{r_n}}{a_n u} \mid M_{r_n} > a_n u\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(\{Z_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\})$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $\tilde{l}_0$. Moreover, $\{Q_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and L_Z in (2.3) are independent random elements with values in $\tilde{l}_0$ and $[0, \infty)$ respectively.

Proof. Step 1. We write $\mathbf{X}_n(i, j) = (X_i, \dots, X_j) / a_n u$, $\mathbf{Y}(i, j) = (Y_i, \dots, Y_j)$ and $M_{k,l} = \max_{k \leq i \leq l} |X_i|$, $M_{k,l}^Y = \max_{k \leq i \leq l} |Y_i|$. By the Portmanteau theorem [Bil68, Theorem 2.1], it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)) \mid M_{1, r_n} > a_n u] = \mathbb{E}[g(\{Y_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}) \mid M_{-\infty, -1}^Y \leq 1], \quad (2.4)$$

for every nonnegative, bounded and uniformly continuous function g on $(\tilde{l}_0, \tilde{d})$.

Define the truncation $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\zeta$ at level ζ of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \tilde{l}_0$ by putting all the coordinates of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ which are smaller in absolute value than ζ at zero, that is $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\zeta$ is the equivalence class of $(x_i \mathbb{1}_{|x_i| > \zeta})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where $\mathbf{x}$ is a representative of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Note that by definition, $\tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\zeta) \leq \zeta$.

For a function g on $\tilde{l}_0$, define g_ζ by $g_\zeta(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\zeta)$. If g is uniformly continuous, then for each $\eta > 0$, there exists ζ such that $|g(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) - g(\tilde{\mathbf{y}})| \leq \eta$ if $\tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) \leq \zeta$, that is, $\|g - g_\zeta\|_\infty \leq \eta$. Thus it is sufficient to prove (2.4) for g_ζ for all ζ sufficiently small.

One can now follow the steps of the proof of [BS09, Theorem 4.3]. Decompose the event $\{M_{1,r_n} > a_n u\}$ according to the smallest $j \in \{1, \dots, r_n\}$ such that $|X_j| > a_n u$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)); M_{1,r_n} > a_n u] = \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)); M_{1,j-1} \leq a_n u < |X_j|].$$

Fix a positive integer m and let n be large enough so that $r_n \geq 2m + 1$. By the definition of g_ζ , for all $j \in \{m+1, \dots, r_n - m\}$ we have that

$$M_{1,j-m-1} \vee M_{j+m+1,r_n} \leq a_n u \zeta \Rightarrow g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)) = g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(j-m, j+m))$$

Next define $\theta_n = \mathbb{P}(M_{1,r_n} > a_n u) / \{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n u)\}$. Under Assumption 1.1, it is known that there exists $\theta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = \mathbb{P}(\sup_{i \geq 1} |Y_i| \leq 1) = \theta. \quad (2.5)$$

See [BS09, Proposition 4.2]. Using stationarity now, exactly as in the proof of [BS09, Theorem 4.3], we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} & \left| \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)) \mid M_{1,r_n} > a_n u] \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{\theta_n} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(-m, m)); M_{-m,-1} \leq a_n u \mid |X_0| > a_n u] \right| = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

We now argue that, for every $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(-m, m)); M_{-m,-1} \leq a_n u \mid |X_0| > a_n u] \\ = \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{Y}(-m, m)); M_{-m,-1}^Y \leq 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

First observe that g_ζ , as a function on $\mathbb{R}^{2m+1}$, is continuous except maybe on the set $D_\zeta^{2m+1} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{2m+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+1}; |x_i| = \zeta \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, 2m+1\}\}$ and we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}(-m, m) \in D_\zeta^{2m+1}) = 0$. Observe similarly that the distribution of $M_{k,l}^Y = |Y_0| \max_{k \leq j \leq l} |\Theta_j|$ does not have atoms except maybe at zero. Therefore, since g_ζ is bounded, (2.7) follows by the definition of the tail process and the continuous mapping theorem.

Finally, since $\mathbf{Y}(-m, m) \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$ a.s. in $\tilde{l}_0$ and since $\mathbf{Y}$ has only finitely many coordinates greater than ζ , $g_\zeta(\mathbf{Y}(-m, m)) = g_\zeta(\mathbf{Y})$ for large enough m , almost surely. Thus, applying (2.6) and (2.7), we obtain by bounded convergence

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(1, r_n)) \mid M_{1, r_n} > a_n u] \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_n} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{X}_n(-m, m)); M_{-m, -1} \leq a_n u \mid |X_0| > a_n u] \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{Y}(-m, m)); M_{-m, -1}^Y \leq 1] \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbb{E}[g_\zeta(\mathbf{Y}); M_{-\infty, -1}^Y \leq 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to $g \equiv 1$ we obtain $\theta = \mathbb{P}(M_{-\infty, -1}^Y \leq 1)$. Hence (2.4) holds for g_ζ as we wanted to show.

Step 2. Observing that the mapping $\tilde{x} \mapsto (\tilde{x}, \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty)$ is continuous on $\tilde{l}_0$, we obtain for every $u > 0$,

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\frac{X_1, \dots, X_{r_n}}{a_n u}, \frac{M_{r_n}}{a_n u} \mid M_{r_n} > a_n u \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(\{Z_j\}, L_Z). \quad (2.8)$$

Similarly, the mapping defined on $\tilde{l}_0 \times (0, \infty)$ by $(\tilde{x}, b) \mapsto \tilde{x}/b$ is again continuous. Hence, (2.8) implies

$$\mathcal{L} \left(\frac{X_1, \dots, X_{r_n}}{M_{r_n}}, \frac{M_{r_n}}{a_n u} \mid M_{r_n} > a_n u \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(\{Q_j\}, L_Z) \quad (2.9)$$

by the continuous mapping theorem. To show the independence between L_Z and $\{Q_j\}$, it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\{Q_j\}) \mathbb{1}_{\{L_Z > v\}}] = \mathbb{E}[g(\{Q_j\})] P(L_Z > v), \quad (2.10)$$

for an arbitrary uniformly continuous function g on $\tilde{l}_0$ and $v \geq 1$.

By (2.9), the left-hand side of (2.10) is the limit of

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g \left(\frac{X_1, \dots, X_{r_n}}{M_{r_n}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{(a_n)^{-1} M_{r_n} > v\}} \mid M_{r_n} > a_n \right],$$

which further equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g \left(\frac{X_1, \dots, X_{r_n}}{M_{r_n}} \right) \mid M_{r_n} > a_n v \right] \frac{\mathbb{P}(M_{r_n} > a_n v)}{\mathbb{P}(M_{r_n} > a_n)}.$$

By (2.9), the first term in the product above tends to $\mathbb{E}[g(\{Q_j\})]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, by (2.5) and regular variation of $|X_0|$, the second term tends to $v^{-\alpha} = \mathbb{P}(L_Z > v)$.

□

3 The point process of clusters

In this section we prove our main result on the point process asymptotics for the sequence $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Prior to that, we introduce the topology of $w^\#$ -convergence.

3.1 Preliminaries on $w^\#$ -convergence

To study convergence in distribution of point processes on a non locally-compact space $\tilde{l}_0$ we introduce the notion of $w^\#$ -convergence and refer to [DVJ03, Section A2.6.] and [DVJ08, Section 11.1.] for details. Let $\mathbb{X}$ be a complete and separable metric space and let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ denote the space of boundedly finite nonnegative Borel measures μ on $\mathbb{X}$, i.e. such that $\mu(B) < \infty$ for all bounded Borel sets B . The subset of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ of all point measures is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{X})$. A sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ is said to converge to μ in the $w^\#$ -topology, noted by $\mu_n \rightarrow_{w^\#} \mu$, if

$$\mu_n(f) = \int f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int f d\mu = \mu(f),$$

for every bounded and continuous function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded support. Equivalently, $\mu_n \rightarrow_{w^\#} \mu$ refers to

$$\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$$

for every bounded Borel set B with $\mu(\partial B) = 0$. We note that $w^\#$ -convergence coincides with vague convergence when $\mathbb{X}$ is locally compact, we refer to [Kal83] or [Res87] for details on vague convergence. The notion of $w^\#$ -convergence is metrizable in such a way that $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})$ is Polish. Denote by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X}))$ the corresponding Borel sigma-field.

It is known, see [DVJ08, Theorem 11.1.VII], that a sequence $\{N_n\}$ of random elements in $(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X})))$, converges in distribution to N , denoted by $N_n \xrightarrow{d} N$, if and only if

$$(N_n(A_1), \dots, N_n(A_k)) \xrightarrow{d} (N(A_1), \dots, N(A_k)) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^k,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all bounded Borel sets $A_1, \dots, A_k$ in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $N(\partial A_i) = 0$ a.s. for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Remark 3.1. As shown in [DVJ08, Proposition 11.1.VIII], this is equivalent to the pointwise convergence of the Laplace functionals, that is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-N_n(f)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-N(f)}]$ for all bounded and continuous function f on $\mathbb{X}$ with bounded support. It turns out that it is sufficient (and more convenient in our context) to verify the convergence of Laplace functionals for a smaller convergence determining family. See the comments before Assumption 3.4.

3.2 Point process convergence

Consider a sequence $\{r_n\}$ as in Assumption 1.1. Set $k_n = \lfloor n/r_n \rfloor$ and

$$\mathbf{X}_{n,i} = (X_{(i-1)r_n+1}, \dots, X_{ir_n})/a_n$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k_n$. Define the point process of clusters N_n'' on $[0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ by

$$N_n'' = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(i/k_n, \mathbf{X}_{n,i})}.$$

We will study the convergence of N_n'' in the space of measures on $[0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ which are finite on the sets bounded away from the line $[0, 1] \times \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$. To do that, we embed $\tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ into a new space where $w^\#$ -convergence theory described above is applicable (see [HL05, Section 2], cf. [DMZ08, Section 4.1]).

Denote by $\mathbb{S} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \tilde{l}_0 : \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty = 1\}$ the unit sphere in $\tilde{l}_0$ and consider the space $\mathbb{O} = (0, +\infty] \times \mathbb{S}$, which, endowed with the metric

$$\rho((r, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}), (s, \tilde{\mathbf{y}})) = |1/r - 1/s| \vee \tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}),$$

is complete and separable. We can identify $\tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ with $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}$ since the polar decomposition $\psi : \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \mapsto (\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}/\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty)$ is a homeomorphism. Notice that a set B is bounded in $\mathbb{O}$ if and only if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty > \epsilon$ for all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in B$, i.e. B is bounded away from zero.

Let $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ be the space of all Borel measures on $\tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ which are finite on the sets bounded away from $\tilde{\mathbf{0}}$. Since ψ is a homeomorphism, transformation $\mu \mapsto \mu \circ \psi^{-1}$, allows one to identify $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ with the subspace of measures in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{O})$ which put no mass at infinity, that is in the set $\{+\infty\} \times \mathbb{S}$. Consequently we can endow $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ with the $w^\#$ -topology inherited from $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{O})$. For example, it is straightforward to show that a sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ in $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ converges to μ , which we also denote by $\mu_n \rightarrow_{w^\#} \mu$, if

$$\mu_n(f) = \int f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int f d\mu = \mu(f),$$

for every bounded and continuous functions $f : \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with support bounded away from $\tilde{\mathbf{0}}$, i.e. there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ if $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. Similar arguments in a different form have been used already by Davydov et al. in [DMZ08]. Compare also with the theory developed in Hult and Lindskog [HL06].

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumption 1.1, the sequence $\nu_n = k_n \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{n,1} \in \cdot)$ in $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ converges to $\nu = (d(-\theta y^{-\alpha}) \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}) \circ \psi$ in $w^\#$ -topology, where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is the distribution of $\{Q_j\}$ defined in (2.3).*

Proof. Let f be bounded and continuous function on $\tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ if $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$. Then $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n,1})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n,1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{1,r_n} > \epsilon a_n\}}]$, so by (1.5), (2.5) and Theorem 2.2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n,1})] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > \epsilon a_n) \frac{\mathbb{P}(M_{1,r_n} > \epsilon a_n)}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > \epsilon a_n)} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n,1}) \mid M_{1,r_n} > \epsilon a_n] \\ &= \epsilon^{-\alpha} \theta \mathbb{E}[f(\epsilon \mathbf{Z})]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 2.2, the last expression is equal to

$$\epsilon^{-\alpha} \theta \int_1^\infty \mathbb{E}[f(\epsilon y \mathbf{Q})] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy = \theta \int_\epsilon^\infty \mathbb{E}[f(y \mathbf{Q})] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy .$$

Finally, since $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_\infty = 1$ a.s. and $f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ if $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(f) = \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[f(y \mathbf{Q})] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy = \nu(f) ,$$

by definition of ν . □

Remark 3.3. The previous lemma is closely related to the large deviations result obtained in Mikosch and Wintenberger [MW16, Theorem 3.1]. For a class of functions f called cluster functionals, which can be directly linked to the functions we used in the proof of Lemma 3.2, they showed that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(a_n^{-1} X_1, \dots, a_n^{-1} X_{r_n})]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[f(y\{\Theta_t, t \geq 0\}) - f(y\{\Theta_t, t \geq 1\})] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy . \quad (3.1)$$

However, for an arbitrary function $f : \tilde{l}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with support bounded away from $\tilde{\mathbf{0}}$ which is a.e. continuous with respect to ν , Lemma 3.2 yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(a_n^{-1} X_1, \dots, a_n^{-1} X_{r_n})]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(f) = \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[f(y \mathbf{Q})] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy ,$$

using the continuous mapping argument and the fact that $k_n^{-1} \sim r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)$, which gives an alternative and arguably more interpretable expression for the limit in (3.1).

Analogously to $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$, we define $\mathcal{M}^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ as the space of all Borel measures on $[0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ which are finite on the sets bounded away from the line $[0, 1] \times \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$, and endow it with the $w^\#$ -topology. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{M}^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ of all point measures. To show convergence of N_n'' in $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$, we will need to assume that, intuitively speaking, one can break the dependent series $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$ into asymptotically independent blocks.

It can be shown that the class of Lipschitz continuous functions which depend only on coordinates greater than some $\epsilon > 0$, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_+$, is convergence determining (in the sense of Remark 3.1).

Assumption 3.4. *There exists a sequence of integers $\{r_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/r_n = \infty$ and*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E}[e^{-N_n''(f)}] - \prod_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -f \left(\frac{i}{k_n}, \mathbf{X}_{n,i} \right) \right\} \right] \right) = 0 ,$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_+$.

We prove in Lemma 6.2 that β -mixing implies Assumption 3.4.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a stationary regularly varying sequence with tail index α , satisfying Assumptions 1.1 and 3.4 for the same sequence $\{r_n\}$. Then $N_n'' \xrightarrow{d} N''$ in $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ where N'' is a Poisson point process with intensity measure $\text{Leb} \times \nu$ which can be expressed as*

$$N'' = \sum_i \delta_{(T_i, P_i, \mathbf{Q}_i)}, \quad (3.2)$$

where

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i)}$ is a Poisson point process on $[0, 1] \times (0, \infty]$ with intensity measure $\text{Leb} \times d(-\theta y^{-\alpha})$;
- (ii) $\{\mathbf{Q}_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. elements in $\mathbb{S}$, independent of $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i)}$ and with common distribution equal to the distribution of $\mathbf{Q}$ in Theorem 2.2.

Proof. Let, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_{n,i}^*, i = 1, \dots, k_n\}$ be independent copies of $\mathbf{X}_{n,1}$ and define

$$N_n^* = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(i/k_n, \mathbf{X}_{n,i}^*)}. \quad (3.3)$$

By Assumption 3.4 the weak limits of N_n'' and N_n^* must coincide. By the previous lemma, $k_n \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{n,1} \in \cdot) \rightarrow_{w^\#} \nu$ in $\mathcal{M}^0(\tilde{l}_0)$ and now the convergence of N_n^* to N'' in $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ follows by an adaptation of [Res87, Proposition 3.21]. While this proposition applies to weak convergence of point processes with a locally compact state space, our state space $[0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ is not locally compact. However, since the proof only involves Laplace functionals of the underlying point processes, it remains valid if one changes from vague convergence used therein to $w^\#$ -convergence as described above. See also [dHL01, Theorem 2.4] or [RS15, Proposition 2.13]. The representation of N'' follows easily by standard Poisson point process transformation (see [Res87, Section 3.3.2.]). $\square$

4 Convergence of the partial sum process

In order to study the convergence of the partial sum process in cases where it fails to hold in the usual space D , we first introduce an enlarged space E .

4.1 The space of decorated càdlàg functions

To establish convergence of the partial sum process of a dependent sequence $\{X_n\}$ we need to consider a function space larger than $D \equiv D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$. Closely following [Whi02,

Sections 15.4 and 15.5], we introduce the function space $E \equiv E([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ of decorated càdlàg functions. Intuitively speaking, elements in E are built from càdlàg functions to which at all jump points we attach a closed interval (i.e. decoration). More precisely, the elements of E have the form

$$(x, J, \{I(t) : t \in J\}),$$

where $x \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$, J is a countable subset of $[0, 1]$ with

$$\text{Disc}(x) \subseteq J,$$

and, for each $t \in J$, $I(t)$ is a closed bounded interval in $\mathbb{R}$ with at least two points such that

$$x(t), x(t-) \in I(t),$$

for all $t \in J$. Moreover, we assume that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there are at most finitely many times t for which the length of the interval $I(t)$ is greater than ϵ . By [WHi02, Theorem 15.4.2.] this ensures that the graphs of elements in E , defined below, are compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Paralleling the construction of the M_2 topology on D (see [WHi02]), this allows one to impose a metric on E by using the Hausdorff metric on the space of graphs of elements in E .

We associate with every triple $(x, J, \{I(t) : t \in J\})$ a set-valued function

$$x'(t) := \begin{cases} I(t), & t \in J \\ \{x(t)\}, & t \notin J, \end{cases}$$

and for every such x' we define its graph by

$$\Gamma_{x'} := \{(t, z) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} : z \in x'(t)\}.$$

As we can construct the triple $(x, J, \{I(t) : t \in J\})$, the set-valued function x' and the graph $\Gamma_{x'}$ starting from any one of the three, these are equivalent representations of the elements in E . In the sequel, we will usually denote the elements of E by x' .

Let m denote the Hausdorff metric on the space of compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e., for compact subsets A, B ,

$$m(A, B) = \mu(A, B) \vee \mu(B, A)$$

where

$$\mu(A, B) = \sup_{x \in A} \|x - B\|_\infty$$

and

$$\|x - A\|_\infty = \inf_{y \in A} |x_1 - y_1| \vee |x_2 - y_2|.$$

We then define a metric on E , denoted also by m without confusion, by

$$m(x', y') := m(\Gamma_{x'}, \Gamma_{y'}).$$

We call the topology induced by m on E the M_2 topology. As shown in [Whi02], the metric space (E, m) is a separable, but not complete. Also, we define the uniform metric on E by

$$m^*(x', y') = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} m(x'(t), y'(t)), \quad (4.1)$$

where m is again the Hausdorff metric, but here applied to the space of compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. Obviously, m^* is a stronger metric than m , i.e. for any $x', y' \in E$,

$$m(x', y') \leq m^*(x', y'). \quad (4.2)$$

We will often use the following elementary fact: for $a \leq b$ and $c \leq d$ it holds that

$$m([a, b], [c, d]) \leq |c - a| \vee |d - b|. \quad (4.3)$$

By a slight abuse of notation, we identify every $x \in D$ with an element in E represented by

$$(x, \text{Disc}(x), \{[x(t-), x(t)] : t \in \text{Disc}(x)\}) ,$$

where for any two real numbers a, b by $[a, b]$ we denote the closed interval $[\min\{a, b\}, \max\{a, b\}]$. Consequently, we identify the space D with the subset D' of E given by

$$D' = \{x' \in E : J = \text{Disc}(x) \text{ and for all } t \in J, I(t) = [x(t-), x(t)]\} . \quad (4.4)$$

As observed in [Whi02, Theorem 15.4.6.], for an element $x' \in D'$ we have

$$\Gamma_{x'} = \Gamma_x,$$

where Γ_x is the completed graph of x . Since the M_2 topology on D corresponds to the Hausdorff metric on the space of the completed graphs Γ_x , the next result is immediate.

Lemma 4.1. *The space D endowed with the M_2 topology is homeomorphic to the subset D' in E with the M_2 topology.*

Remark 4.2. Because two elements in E can have intervals at the same time point, the addition in E is in general not well behaved. However, problems disappear if one of the summands is a continuous function. In such a case, the sum is naturally defined as follows: consider an element $x' = (x, J, \{I(t) : t \in J\})$ in E and a continuous function b on $[0, 1]$, we define the element $x' + b$ in E by

$$x' + b = (x + b, J, \{I(t) + b(t) : t \in J\}) .$$

We now state a useful characterization of convergence in (E, m) in terms of the local-maximum function defined for any $x' \in E$ by

$$M_{t_1, t_2}(x') := \sup\{z : z \in x'(t), t_1 \leq t \leq t_2\}, \quad (4.5)$$

for $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq 1$. Note that, given $M_{t_1, t_2}(x')$ and $M_{t_1, t_2}(-x')$ for $t_1 < t_2$ in a countable dense subset of $[0, 1]$, one can reconstruct x' .

Theorem 4.3 (Theorem 15.5.1. Whitt [Wht02]). *For elements $x'_n, x' \in E$ the following are equivalent:*

(i) $x'_n \rightarrow x'$ in (E, m) , i.e. $m(x'_n, x') \rightarrow 0$.

(ii) For all $t_1 < t_2$ in a countable dense subset of $[0, 1]$, including 0 and 1,

$$M_{t_1, t_2}(x'_n) \rightarrow M_{t_1, t_2}(x') \text{ in } \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$M_{t_1, t_2}(-x'_n) \rightarrow M_{t_1, t_2}(-x') \text{ in } \mathbb{R}.$$

4.2 Invariance principle in the space E

Consider the partial sum process in $D([0, 1])$ defined by

$$S_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{X_i}{a_n}, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

and define also

$$V_n(t) = \begin{cases} S_n(t) & \text{if } 0 < \alpha < 1, \\ S_n(t) - \lfloor nt \rfloor \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{X_1}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_1|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right) & \text{if } 1 \leq \alpha < 2. \end{cases}$$

As usual, when $1 \leq \alpha < 2$, an additional condition is needed to deal with the small jumps.

Assumption 4.4. *For all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \{X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i| \leq a_n \epsilon\}} - \mathbb{E}[X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i| \leq a_n \epsilon\}}]\} \right| > a_n \delta \right) = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

It is known from [DH95] that marginal distributions of V_n converge to those of an α -stable Lévy process. This result is strengthened in [BKS12] to convergence in the M_1 topology if $Q_j Q_{j'} \geq 0$ for all $j \neq j' \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e. if all extremes within one cluster have the same sign. In the next theorem, we remove any assumption of this kind and establish the convergence of the process V_n in the space E . Moreover, we give the description of the limit in terms of the point process $N'' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i, Q_i)}$ from Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a stationary regularly varying sequence with tail index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, satisfying Assumptions 1.1 and 3.4 for the same sequence $\{r_n\}$. If $\alpha \geq 1$, assume moreover that Assumption 4.4 holds and that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_j| \right)^\alpha \right] < \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

Then

$$V_n \xrightarrow{d} V' = (V, \{T_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{I(T_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) ,$$

with respect to M_2 topology on $E([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$, where

(i) V is an α -stable Lévy process on $[0, 1]$ given by

$$V(\cdot) = \sum_{T_i \leq \cdot} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i Q_{i,j} , \quad 0 < \alpha < 1 , \quad (4.8a)$$

$$V(\cdot) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\sum_{T_i \leq \cdot} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| > \epsilon\}} - (\cdot) \int_{\epsilon < |x| \leq 1} x \mu(dx) \right) , \quad 1 \leq \alpha < 2 , \quad (4.8b)$$

where the last limit holds almost surely uniformly on $[0, 1]$ and μ is defined in (1.3).

(ii) For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I(T_i) = V(T_i-) + \left[\inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} P_i Q_{i,j} , \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} P_i Q_{i,j} \right] .$$

Before proving the theorem, we make some comments and illustrate it with the causal linear processes of Example 1.2.

Remark 4.6. By [DH95, Theorem 2.6] for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ it holds that $\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_j|^\alpha)] < \infty$ and therefore (4.7) always holds in this case, since the function $x \mapsto x^\alpha$ is concave on $[0, \infty)$. For $\alpha \geq 1$, the summability of this series must be assumed. It can be readily checked that for $\alpha > 1$, (4.7) is implied by 1.1 and the following intra-block negligibility condition

$$\lim_{\epsilon > 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |X_i| \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i| \leq a_n \epsilon\}} > a_n \delta)}{r_n \bar{F}(a_n)} = 0 .$$

Remark 4.7. If (4.7) holds, the sums $W_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_{i,j}|$ are almost surely well-defined and $\{W_i, i \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with $\mathbb{E}[W_i^\alpha] < \infty$. Furthermore, by independence of $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_{P_i}$ and $\{W_i\}$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_{P_i W_i}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty]$ with intensity measure $\theta \mathbb{E}[W_1^\alpha] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy$. In particular, for every $\delta > 0$ there a.s. exists at most finitely many indices i such that $P_i W_i > \delta$. Also, this implies that

$$\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{i,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.9)$$

almost surely as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. These facts will be used several times in the proof.

Remark 4.8. Let θ be as in (2.5). Under the condition of β -mixing it is shown in [BS09, Theorem 4.5] that θ is also the extremal index of the time series $\{|X_j|\}$. The Lévy process

V from Theorem 4.5 is the weak limit in the sense of finite dimensional distributions of the partial sum process V_n , characterized by

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{izV(1)}] = \begin{cases} i\mu z + \Gamma(1-\alpha) \cos(\pi\alpha/2) \sigma^\alpha |z|^\alpha \{1 - i\beta \operatorname{sgn}(z) \tan(\pi\alpha/2)\} & \alpha \neq 1, \\ i\mu z + \frac{\pi}{2} |z| \{1 - i\frac{2}{\pi} \beta \operatorname{sgn}(z) \log(|z|)\} & \alpha = 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

with

$$\sigma^\alpha = \theta \mathbb{E}[|\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j|^\alpha],$$

skewness

$$\beta = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j)_+^\alpha] - \mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j)_-^\alpha]}{\mathbb{E}[|\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j|^\alpha]}$$

and $\mu = 0$ if $\alpha < 1$, $\mu = \alpha\beta/(\alpha - 1)$ if $\alpha > 1$ and $\mu = \beta \int_0^\infty (\sin r - r \mathbb{1}_{\{r \leq 1\}}) r^{-2} dr$ if $\alpha = 1$. It can be shown that this coincides with expressions for the skewness obtained in the literature in terms of the spectral tail process $\{\Theta_j\}$, see e.g. [MW16, Theorem 4.3]

Example 4.9. Following Example 1.2, consider a causal linear process $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with respect to a sequence of i.i.d. nonnegative random variables $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with regularly varying distribution with index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ which we assume centered if $\alpha > 1$ and for simplicity symmetric if $\alpha = 1$. Recall that $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^\infty c_j Z_{t-j}$, where $\{c_j, j \geq 0\}$ satisfies an additional summability condition. The sequence $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is then stationary and regularly varying with tail index α with tail process given in Example 1.2. From there it follows that for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\frac{Y_t}{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} |Y_i|} = \frac{c_{t+N}}{\max_{i \geq 0} |c_i|}. \quad (4.11)$$

Conditions for strong mixing or absolute regularity of linear processes are also well known, but they impose stringent restrictions on the coefficients c_j and typically require Z_0 to have an absolutely continuous density with respect to Lebesgue's measure. Such processes are more efficiently studied by truncation methods. See e.g. [DR85] and its sequels.

However, all the conditions of the theorem above are straightforward to check in the case of finite order moving average process. For an illustration consider the process

$$X_t = Z_t + cZ_{t-1}.$$

By (4.11), the sequence $\{Q_j\}$ as a random element in the space $\tilde{l}_0$ (see Theorem 2.2) is equal to a positive multiple of the sequence $\{\dots, 0, 1, c, 0, \dots\}$, i.e. it is a deterministic sequence.

In the case $c \geq 0$, the convergence of partial sum process was established by Avram and Taqqu [AT92] using M_1 topology. On the other hand, for negative c 's convergence fails in any of Skorohod's topology, but partial sums do have a limit in the sense described by our theorem as can be also guessed from Figure 1.




Figure 1: A simulated sample path of the process S_n in the case of linear sequence $X_t = Z_t - 0.7Z_{t-1}$ with index of regular variation $\alpha = 0.7$ in blue. Observe that due to downward “corrections” after each large jump, in the limit the paths of the process S_n cannot converge to a càdlàg function.

Remark 4.10. We do not exclude the case $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j = 0$ with probability one, as happens for instance in Example 4.9 with $c = -1$. In such a case, the càdlàg component V is simply the null process.

Example 4.11. Consider a stationary GARCH(1, 1) process

$$X_t = \sigma_t Z_t, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1 > 0$, and $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and variance one. Under mild conditions the process $\{X_t\}$ is regularly varying and satisfies Assumptions 1.1 and 3.4. These hold for instance in the case of standard normal innovations Z_t and sufficiently small parameters α_1, β_1 , see [MW13, Section 4.4]. Consider for simplicity such a stationary GARCH(1, 1) process with tail index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Since all the conditions of Theorem 4.5 are met, its partial sum process has a limit in the space E (cf. Figure 2).

Proof of Theorem 4.5. The proof is long and split into the cases $\alpha < 1$ which is simpler and the case $\alpha \in [1, 2)$ where centering and truncation makes additional technical difficulties.




Figure 2: A simulated sample path of the process S_n in the case of GARCH(1, 1) process with parameters $\alpha_0 = 0.01$, $\alpha_1 = 1.45$ and $\beta_1 = 0.1$, and tail index α between 0.5 and 1.

(a) Assume first that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. For every $\epsilon > 0$, consider the functions s^ϵ, u^ϵ and v^ϵ defined on $\tilde{l}_0$ by

$$s^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_j x_j \mathbb{1}_{\{|x_j| > \epsilon\}}, \quad u^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \inf_k \sum_{j \leq k} x_j \mathbb{1}_{\{|x_j| > \epsilon\}}, \quad v^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \sup_k \sum_{j \leq k} x_j \mathbb{1}_{\{|x_j| > \epsilon\}},$$

and define the mapping $T^\epsilon : \mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0) \rightarrow E$ by setting, for $m = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_{t_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i}$,

$$T^\epsilon m = \left(\left(\sum_{t_i \leq t} s^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) \right)_{t \in [0, 1]}, \{t_i : \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i\|_\infty > \epsilon\}, \{I(t_i) : \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i\|_\infty > \epsilon\} \right),$$

where

$$I(t_i) = \sum_{t_j < t_i} s^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^j) + \left[\sum_{t_k = t_i} u^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k), \sum_{t_k = t_i} v^\epsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^k) \right].$$

Since m belongs $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$, there is only a finite number of points $(t_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i)$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i\|_\infty > \epsilon$ and furthermore, every $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i$ has at most finitely many coordinates greater than ϵ . Therefore, the mapping T^ϵ is well-defined, that is, $T^\epsilon m$ is a proper element of E .

Next, we define the subsets of $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_1 &= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i} : |x_j^i| \neq \epsilon, i \geq 1, j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \\ \Lambda_2 &= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i} : 0 < t_i < 1 \text{ and } t_i \neq t_j \text{ for every } i > j \geq 1 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that T^ϵ is continuous on the set $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$. Assume that $m_n \rightarrow_{w\#} m = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i} \in \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$. By an adaptation of [Res87, Proposition 3.13], this convergence implies that the finitely many points of m_n in every suitable set B bounded away from $\tilde{\mathbf{0}}$, converge pointwise to the finitely many points of m in B . In particular, this holds for $B = \{(t, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) : \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty > \epsilon\}$ and it follows that for all $t_1 < t_2$ in $[0, 1]$ such that $m(\{t_1, t_2\} \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}) = 0$,

$$M_{t_1, t_2}(T^\epsilon(m_n)) \rightarrow M_{t_1, t_2}(T^\epsilon(m)) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$M_{t_1, t_2}(-T^\epsilon(m_n)) \rightarrow M_{t_1, t_2}(-T^\epsilon(m)) \text{ in } \mathbb{R},$$

whith the local-maximum function M_{t_1, t_2} defined as in (4.5). Since the set of all such times is dense in $[0, 1]$ and includes 0 and 1, an application of Theorem 4.3 gives that

$$T^\epsilon(m_n) \rightarrow T^\epsilon(m)$$

in E endowed with the M_2 topology.

Recall the point process $N'' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i \mathbf{Q}_i)}$ from Theorem 3.5. Since the mean measure of $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i)}$ does not have atoms, it is clear that $N'' \in \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$ a.s. Therefore, by the same theorem and the continuous mapping argument

$$\tilde{S}'_{n, \epsilon} \xrightarrow{d} S'_\epsilon,$$

where $\tilde{S}'_{n, \epsilon} = T^\epsilon(N''_n)$ and $S'_\epsilon = T^\epsilon(N'')$.

Step 2. Recall that $W_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_{i, j}|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{P_i W_i}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty]$ with intensity measure $\theta \mathbb{E}[W_i^\alpha] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy$ (see Remark 4.7). Since $\alpha < 1$, one can sum up the points $\{P_i W_i\}$, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i W_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{i, j}| < \infty \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.12)$$

Therefore, defining $s(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_j x_j$, we obtain that the process

$$V(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} s(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

is almost surely a well-defined element in D and moreover, it is an α -stable Lévy process. Further, we define an element V' in $E([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ by

$$V' = (V, \{T_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{I(T_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) , \quad (4.13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I(T_i) &= V(T_i-) + [u(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i), v(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i)] , \\ u(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) &= \inf_k \sum_{j \leq k} x_j , \quad v(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \sup_k \sum_{j \leq k} x_j . \end{aligned}$$

Since for every $\delta > 0$ there are at most finitely many points $P_i W_i$ such that $P_i W_i > \delta$ and $\text{diam}(I(T_i)) = v(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) - u(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) \leq P_i W_i$, V' is indeed a proper element of E a.s.

We now show that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the limits S'_ϵ from the previous step converge to V' in (E, m) almost surely. Recall the uniform metric m^* on E defined in (4.1). By (4.12) and dominated convergence theorem

$$m^*(S'_\epsilon, V') = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} m(S'_\epsilon(t), V'(t)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{ij}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{ij}| \leq \epsilon\}} \rightarrow 0 , \quad (4.14)$$

almost surely as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, let S_ϵ be the càdlàg part of S'_ϵ , i.e.

$$S_\epsilon(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} s^\epsilon(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| > \epsilon\}} , \quad t \in [0, 1] .$$

If $t \notin \{T_i\}$ then

$$m(S'_\epsilon(t), V'(t)) = |S_\epsilon(t) - V(t)| \leq \sum_{T_i \leq t} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{i,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}} .$$

Further, when $t = T_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, by using (4.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m(S'_\epsilon(t), V'(t)) &\leq |(S_\epsilon(T_k-) + v^\epsilon(P_k \mathbf{Q}_k)) - (V(T_k-) + v(P_k \mathbf{Q}_k))| \\ &\quad \vee |(S_\epsilon(T_k-) + u^\epsilon(P_k \mathbf{Q}_k)) - (V(T_k-) + u(P_k \mathbf{Q}_k))| . \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of the equation above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{T_i < T_k} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}} \right| + \left| \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq l} P_k Q_{k,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_k Q_{k,j}| > \epsilon\}} - \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq l} P_k Q_{k,j} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{T_i < T_k} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}} \right| + \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{j \leq l} P_k Q_{k,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_k Q_{k,j}| > \epsilon\}} - \sum_{j \leq l} P_k Q_{k,j} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{T_i \leq T_k} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{i,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}} . \end{aligned}$$

Since, by similar arguments, one can obtain the same bound for the second term on the right-hand side of (4.15), (4.14) holds. It now follows from (4.2) that

$$S'_\epsilon \rightarrow V'$$

almost surely in (E, m) .

Step 3. Recall that

$$\mathbf{X}_{n,i} = (X_{(i-1)r_n+1}, \dots, X_{ir_n})/a_n$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k_n$ and let $\tilde{S}'_n$ be an element in E defined by

$$\left(\left(\sum_{i/k_n \leq t} s(\mathbf{X}_{n,i}) \right)_{t \in [0,1]}, \{i/k_n\}_{i=1}^{k_n}, \{I(i/k_n)\}_{i=1}^{k_n} \right),$$

where

$$I(i/k_n) = \sum_{j < i} s(\mathbf{X}_{n,j}) + [u(\mathbf{X}_{n,i}), v(\mathbf{X}_{n,i})].$$

By [Bil68, Theorem 4.2] and the previous two steps, to show that

$$\tilde{S}'_n \xrightarrow{d} V'$$

in (E, m) , it suffices to prove that, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(m(\tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}'_n) > \delta) = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Note first that, by the same arguments as in the previous step, we have

$$m^*(\tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}'_n) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k_n r_n} \frac{|X_j|}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_j| \leq a_n \epsilon\}}.$$

By (4.2), Markov's inequality and Karamata's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(m(\tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}'_n) > \delta) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k_n r_n}{\delta a_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_1| \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_1| \leq a_n \epsilon\}}] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\delta a_n} \cdot \frac{\alpha a_n \epsilon \mathbb{P}(|X_1| > a_n \epsilon)}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)\delta} \epsilon^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.16) since $\alpha < 1$ and hence

$$\tilde{S}'_n \xrightarrow{d} V'$$

in (E, m) .

Step 4. Finally, to show that the original partial sum process S_n (and therefore V_n since $\alpha \in (0, 1)$) also converges in distribution to V' in (E, m) , by Slutsky argument it suffices to prove that

$$m(S_n, \tilde{S}'_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (4.17)$$

Recall that $k_n = \lfloor n/r_n \rfloor$ so $\frac{ir_n}{n} \leq \frac{i}{k_n}$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, k_n$ and moreover

$$\frac{i}{k_n} - \frac{ir_n}{n} = \frac{i}{k_n} \left(1 - \frac{k_n r_n}{n}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{\lfloor n/r_n \rfloor}{n/r_n} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\{n/r_n\}}{n/r_n}\right) \leq \frac{r_n}{n}. \quad (4.18)$$

Let $d_{n,i}$ for $i = 0, \dots, k_n - 1$ be the Hausdorff distance between restrictions of graphs Γ_{S_n} and $\Gamma_{\tilde{S}'_n}$ on time intervals $(\frac{ir_n}{n}, \frac{(i+1)r_n}{n}]$ and $(\frac{i}{k_n}, \frac{i+1}{k_n}]$, respectively (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: Restrictions of graphs Γ_{S_n} and $\Gamma_{\tilde{S}'_n}$ on time intervals $(\frac{ir_n}{n}, \frac{(i+1)r_n}{n}]$ and $(\frac{i}{k_n}, \frac{i+1}{k_n}]$, respectively.

First note that, by (4.18), the time distance between any two points on these graphs is at most $2r_n/n$. Further, by construction, S_n and $\tilde{S}'_n$ have the same range of values on these time intervals. More precisely,

$$\bigcup_{t \in (\frac{ir_n}{n}, \frac{(i+1)r_n}{n}]} \{z \in \mathbb{R} : (t, z) \in \Gamma_{S_n}\} = \bigcup_{t \in (\frac{i}{k_n}, \frac{i+1}{k_n}]} \{z \in \mathbb{R} : (t, z) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{S}'_n}\} = \tilde{S}'_n((i+1)/k_n).$$

Therefore, the distance between the graphs comes only from the time component, i.e.

$$d_{n,i} \leq \frac{2r_n}{n} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, k_n - 1$.

Moreover, if we let d_{n,k_n} be the Hausdorff distance between the restriction of the graph Γ_{S_n} on $(\frac{k_n r_n}{n}, 1]$ and the interval $(1, \tilde{S}'_n(1))$, it holds that

$$d_{n,k_n} \leq \frac{r_n}{n} \vee \sum_{j=k_n r_n + 1}^n \frac{|X_j|}{a_n} \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, (4.17) holds since

$$m(S_n, \tilde{S}'_n) \leq \bigvee_{i=0}^{k_n} d_{n,i},$$

and this finishes the proof in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

(b) Assume now that $\alpha \in [1, 2)$. As shown in Step 1. in the proof of (a), it holds that

$$\tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{d} S'_\epsilon \quad (4.19)$$

in E , where $\tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon} = T^\epsilon(N''_n)$ and $S'_\epsilon = T^\epsilon(N'')$.

For every $\epsilon > 0$ define a càdlàg process $S_{n,\epsilon}$ by setting, for $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$S_{n,\epsilon}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{X_i}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i|/a_n > \epsilon\}}.$$

Using the same arguments as in Step 4. in the proof of (a), it holds that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$m(S_{n,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}'_{n,\epsilon}) \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (4.20)$$

Therefore, by Slutsky argument it follows from (4.20) and (4.19) that

$$S_{n,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{d} S'_\epsilon \quad (4.21)$$

in (E, m) .

Since $\alpha \in [1, 2)$ we need to introduce centering, so we define the càdlàg process $V_{n,\epsilon}$ by setting, for $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$V_{n,\epsilon}(t) = S_{n,\epsilon}(t) - \lfloor nt \rfloor \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{X_1}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_1|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right).$$

From (1.4) we have, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lfloor nt \rfloor \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{X_1}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_1|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right) \rightarrow t \int_{\{x : \epsilon < |x| \leq 1\}} x \mu(dx). \quad (4.22)$$

Since the limit function above is continuous and the convergence is uniform on $[0, 1]$, by Lemma 6.3 and (4.21) it follows that

$$V_{n,\epsilon} \xrightarrow{d} V'_\epsilon \quad (4.23)$$

in E , where V'_ϵ is given by (see Remark 4.2)

$$V'_\epsilon(t) = S'_\epsilon(t) - t \int_{\{x : \epsilon < |x| \leq 1\}} x \mu(dx).$$

Let V_ϵ be the càdlàg part of V'_ϵ , i.e.

$$V_\epsilon(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} s^\epsilon(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) - t \int_{\{x : \epsilon < |x| \leq 1\}} x \mu(dx). \quad (4.24)$$

By Lemma 6.5, V_ϵ converges uniformly a.s. to the process V defined in (4.8b) as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Next, as in Step 2. in the proof of (a) we can define a element V' in E by

$$V' = (V, \{T_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{I(T_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$I(T_i) = V(T_i-) + [u(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i), v(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i)], \quad (4.26)$$

Also, one can argue similarly as in the proof of (4.14) to conclude that

$$m^*(V', V'_\epsilon) \leq \|V - V_\epsilon\|_\infty + \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_i |Q_{i,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|P_i Q_{i,j}| \leq \epsilon\}},$$

where the uniform metric m^* on E was defined in (4.1). Now it follows from (4.2), (4.9) and a.s. uniform convergence of V_ϵ to V that

$$V'_\epsilon \rightarrow V' \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.27)$$

in $E([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$.

Finally, by (4.23), (4.27) and [Bil68, Theorem 4.2], to show that

$$V_n \xrightarrow{d} V', \quad (4.28)$$

in (E, m) , it suffices to prove that, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(m(V_{n,\epsilon}, V_n) > \delta) = 0. \quad (4.29)$$

But this follows from Assumption 4.4 and (4.2) since

$$m^*(V_{n,\epsilon}, V_n) \leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{X_i}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i|/a_n \leq \epsilon\}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_i}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_i|/a_n \leq \epsilon\}} \right] \right) \right|.$$

Hence (4.28) holds and this finishes the proof.

□

4.3 Supremum of the partial sums process

We next show that the supremum of the partial sum process converges in distribution in D endowed with the M_1 topology, where the limit is the “running supremum” of the limit process V' from Theorem 4.5.

Let V be the Lévy process defined in (4.8) and define the process V^+ on $[0, 1]$ by

$$V^+(t) = \begin{cases} V(t) , & t \notin \{T_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \\ V(t-) + \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} P_i Q_{i,j} , & t = T_i \text{ for some } i \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Define V^- analogously using infimum instead of supremum. Note that V^+ and V^- need not be right-continuous at the jump times T_j . However, their partial supremum or infimum are càdlàg functions.

Theorem 4.12. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 4.5, it holds that*

$$\left(\sup_{s \leq t} V_n(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \left(\sup_{s \leq t} V^+(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]}$$

and

$$\left(\inf_{s \leq t} V_n(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \left(\inf_{s \leq t} V^-(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]}$$

in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ endowed with the M_1 topology.

Proof. We prove the result only for the supremum of the partial sum process since the infimum case is completely analogous.

Define the mapping $\sup : E([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ by

$$\sup(x')(t) = \sup\{z : z \in x'(s), 0 \leq s \leq t\} .$$

Note that $\sup(x')$ is non-decreasing and since for every $\delta > 0$ there are at most finitely many times t for which the $\text{diam}(x'(t))$ is greater than δ , by [Whi02, Theorem 15.4.1.] it follows easily that this mapping is well-defined, i.e. that $\sup(x')$ is indeed an element in D . Also, by construction,

$$\sup(V') = \left(\sup_{s \leq t} V^+(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]}$$

and

$$\sup(V_n) = \left(\sup_{s \leq t} V_n(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]} .$$

Define the subset of E by

$$\Lambda = \{x' \in E : x'(0) = \{0\}\}$$

and assume that $x'_n \rightarrow x'$ in (E, m) , where $x'_n, x' \in \Lambda$. By Theorem 4.3 it follows that

$$\sup(x'_n)(t) = M_{0,t}(x'_n) \rightarrow M_{0,t}(x') = \sup(x')(t)$$

for all t in a dense subset of $(0,1]$, including 1. Also, the convergence trivially holds for $t = 0$ since $\sup(x'_n)(0) = \sup(x')(0) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\sup(x')$ is non-decreasing for all $x' \in E$, we can apply [Whi02, Corollary 12.5.1] and conclude that

$$\sup(x'_n) \rightarrow \sup(x')$$

in D endowed with M_1 topology. Since $V_n, V' \in \Lambda$ almost surely, by Theorem 4.5 and continuous mapping argument it follows that

$$\left(\sup_{s \leq t} V_n(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow{d} \left(\sup_{s \leq t} V^+(s) \right)_{t \in [0,1]}$$

in D endowed with M_1 topology. □

Remark 4.13. Note that when $s(\mathbf{Q}_i) = 0$ a.s., the limit in Theorem 4.12 is simply a so called Fréchet extremal process. For an illustration of the general limiting behavior of running maxima in the case of a linear processes, consider again the moving average of order 1 from Example 4.9. Figure 1 shows a path (dashed line) of the running maxima of the MA(1) process $X_t = Z_t - 0.7Z_{t-1}$.

4.4 M_2 convergence of the partial sum process

We can now characterize the convergence of the partial sum process in the M_2 topology in $D([0, 1])$ by an appropriate condition on the tail process of the sequence $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Assumption 4.14. *The sequence $\{Q_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ satisfies*

$$-\left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \right)_{-} = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} Q_j \leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \leq k} Q_j = \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \right)_{+} \quad a.s. \quad (4.30)$$

i.e. $-s(\mathbf{Q})_{-} = u(\mathbf{Q}) \leq v(\mathbf{Q}) = s(\mathbf{Q})_{+}$ a.s.

Note that this assumption ensures that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \neq 0$ and that the limit process V' from Theorem 4.5 has sample paths in the subset D' of E which was defined in (4.4). By Lemma 4.1, Theorem 4.5 and the continuous mapping theorem, the next result follows immediately.

Theorem 4.15. *If, in addition to conditions in Theorem 4.5, Assumption 4.14 holds, then*

$$V_n \xrightarrow{d} V$$

in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ endowed with the M_2 topology.

Since the supremum functional is continuous with respect to the M_2 topology, this result implies that the limit of the running supremum the partial sum process is the running supremum of the limiting α -stable Lévy process as in the case of i.i.d. random variables.

Example 4.16. Consider again the linear process $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j Z_{t-j}$ of Example 4.9. As we argued therein, the corresponding sequence $\{Q_j\}$ is equal to a positive multiple of the sequence $\{c_j\}$. This implies that Condition (4.30) for M_2 convergence of the partial sum process can be expressed as

$$-\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j\right)_{-} \leq \inf_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^k c_j \leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j\right)_{+}. \quad (4.31)$$

This is exactly [BK14, Condition 3.2]. Note that (4.31) implies that

$$\left|\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j\right| > 0.$$

5 Record times

In this section we study record times in a stationary sequence $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ under the assumptions of Theorem 3.5. However, because record times remain unaltered after strictly increasing transformation, the main result below holds for stationary sequences with a general marginal distribution as long as they can be monotonically transformed into a regularly varying sequence. Moreover, note that the point process convergence in Theorem 3.5 directly extends from the space $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0)$ to the space $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0)$. To make this precise, we adopt the notation of subsection 3.2, and denote

$$N_n'' = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(j/k_n, \mathbf{x}_{n,j})}. \quad (5.1)$$

Observe that by Theorem 3.5, $N_n'' \xrightarrow{d} N''$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where N'' is an appropriate extension of the limiting point process N'' of Theorem 3.5 to the state space $[0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0$.

Let $m = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i, \mathbf{x}^i} \in \mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0)$. Define, for $t > 0$

$$M^m(t) = \sup_{t_i \leq t} \|\mathbf{x}^i\|, \quad M^m(t-) = \sup_{t_i < t} \|\mathbf{x}^i\|,$$

where we set $\sup \emptyset = 0$ for convenience. Next, for $y \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}$ define

$$R^{\mathbf{x}}(y) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_j > y \vee \sup_{i < j} x_i\}},$$

representing the number of records in the sequence $\mathbf{x}$ larger than y , which is finite for $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{l}_0$.

For $m \in \mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0)$, let R_m be the (counting) point process on $(0, \infty)$ defined by

$$R_m = \sum_i \delta_{t_i} R^{\mathbf{x}_i}(M^m(t_i-)) ,$$

hence for arbitrary $0 < a < b$

$$R_m(a, b] = \sum_{a < t_i \leq b} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_j^i > M^m(t_i-) \vee \sup_{k < j} x_k^i\}} .$$

Denote by

$$A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0) = \{m : M^m(t) > 0, \text{ for all } t > 0, \text{ while} \\ \text{all } t_i\text{'s are different as well as all nonzero } x_j^i\text{'s}\} .$$

Lemma 5.1. *The mapping $m \mapsto R_m$ from $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0)$ to $\mathcal{M}_p((0, \infty))$ is continuous at every $m \in A$.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $m \in A$, and assume a sequence $\{m_n\}$ in $\mathcal{M}_p^0([0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0)$ satisfies $m_n \xrightarrow{v} m$. By Portmanteau theorem for vague convergence (see Theorem 3.2 in [Res07]), it is sufficient to show that for all $0 < a < b \in \{t_i\}^c$

$$R_{m_n}(a, b] \rightarrow R_m(a, b] ,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $0 < a < b \in \{t_i\}^c$ there are finitely many time instances, say $t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_k} \in (a, b]$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}_{i_k}\| > M^m(a) > 0$, hence

$$R_m(a, b] = \sum_{t_i \in (a, b]} R^{\mathbf{x}_i}(M^m(t_i-)) = \sum_{j=1}^k R^{\mathbf{x}_{i_j}}(M^m(t_{i_j}-)) . \quad (5.2)$$

For all large enough n there also exist exactly k (depending on a and b) time instances $t_{i_1}^n, \dots, t_{i_k}^n \in (a, b]$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}_{i_k}^n\| > M^m(a)$. Moreover, they satisfy $\mathbf{x}_{i_l}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_{i_l}$ and $t_{i_l}^n \rightarrow t_{i_l}$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence for n large enough

$$R_{m_n}(a, b] = \sum_{t_i^n \in (a, b]} R^{\mathbf{x}_i^n}(M^{m_n}(t_i^n-)) = \sum_{j=1}^k R^{\mathbf{x}_{i_j}^n}(M^{m_n}(t_{i_j}^n-)) . \quad (5.3)$$

Assume $y_n \rightarrow y > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{x} = \{x_i\}$ with x_i 's all different and $\neq y$. Then, it is straightforward to check that

$$R^{\mathbf{x}^n}(y_n) \rightarrow R^{\mathbf{x}}(y) .$$

Observe further that for the choice of t_{i_l} , $t_{i_l}^n$ we made above, it holds that $M^{m_n}(t_{i_l}^n -) \rightarrow M^m(t_{i_l} -)$ since t_i 's are all different. Together with (5.2) and (5.3) this yields

$$R_{m_n}(a, b] \rightarrow R_m(a, b]$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

Consider again a stationary regularly varying sequence $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for which assumptions 1.1 and 3.4 hold. Since we are only interested in records, for convenience we assume $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a nonnegative sequence. Introduce the point process N_n by

$$N_n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(i/n, X_i/a_n)},$$

thus N_n spreads out points equally over time. The process N_n can be viewed as a point process on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, but since $\mathbb{R}$ can be embedded in $\tilde{l}_0$ (by identifying a real number x to a sequence with at most one nonzero coordinate equal to x), in the sequel we treat it as a process on the space $(0, \infty) \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{0}\}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let Assumptions 1.1 and 3.4 hold and let N'' be the point process defined in (3.2). Assume that the tail process satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\text{all nonzero } Q_i \text{'s are mutually different}) = 1$, then*

$$R_{N_n} \xrightarrow{d} R_{N''},$$

in $\mathcal{M}_p((0, \infty))$. Moreover, the limiting process is a compound Poisson process with representation

$$R_{N''} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta_{\tau_i} \kappa_i,$$

where $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta_{\tau_i}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty)$ with intensity measure $x^{-1}dx$ and $\{\kappa_i\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables independent of it with the same distribution as the integer valued random variable $R^Q(1/Z)$ where Z is a Pareto random variable with tail index α , independent of the random element Q .

Proof. Since they are constructed from the same sequence $X_1, X_2, \dots$, the record values of the point process N_n'' in (5.1) correspond to the record values of the point process N_n . By Theorem 3.5, as discussed above, $N_n'' \xrightarrow{d} N''$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so by Lemma 5.1 it follows that

$$R_{N_n''} \xrightarrow{d} R_{N''}. \tag{5.4}$$

Note that record times i/n of the process N_n appear at slightly altered times $(\lfloor i/r_n \rfloor + 1)/k_n$ in the process N_n'' . However, asymptotically the record times are very close. Indeed, take $f \in C_K^+(0, \infty)$, then f has a support on the set of the form $(a, b]$, $0 < a < b$, which can be enlarged slightly to a set $(a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon]$, where $0 < a - \epsilon$ for a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$.

Clearly, f is continuous on that set, even uniformly. Note further that for any such ϵ there is an integer n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$, $i/n \in (a, b]$ implies $(\lfloor i/r_n \rfloor + 1)/k_n \in (a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon]$, and vice versa. Moreover, by uniform continuity of the function f , n_0 can be chosen such that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$\left| f\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - f\left(\frac{\lfloor i/r_n \rfloor + 1}{k_n}\right) \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Consider now the difference between Laplace functionals of the point processes $R_{N_n''}$ and R_{N_n} for a function $f \in C_K^+(0, \infty)$ as above. Since ϵ above can be made arbitrarily small, it follows that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{-f(R_{N_n''})}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-f(R_{N_n})}] \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

which together with (5.4) yields the convergence statement of the theorem.

To prove the representation of the limit, observe that $N'' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i, \mathbf{Q}_i)}$ has records at exactly the same time instances as the process $M_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i)}$, since by the assumptions of the theorem, $\{\mathbf{Q}_i\}$ have all components nonnegative and at least one them is exactly equal to 1. That process is Poisson point process on $[0, \infty] \times (0, \infty]$ with intensity measure $dx \times d(-\theta y^{-\alpha})$. Note that there are infinitely many points of M_0 in any interval $[a, b] \times [0, \epsilon]$ with $a < b$ and $\epsilon > 0$ therefore we write the record times of M_0 as a sequence indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$, denoted by τ_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We denote the corresponding successive record values by U_n . According to [Res87, Proposition 4.9], $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta_{\tau_n}$ is a Poisson point process with intensity $x^{-1}dx$ on $(0, \infty)$. Moreover, by [Res87, Proposition 4.7 (iv)], for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the sequence $\{U_{n+1}/U_n, n \geq k\}$ has the same distribution as $\{e^{\zeta_n/\alpha}, n \geq k\}$ where $\{\zeta_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. unit exponential random variables.

Since the records of the point process $N'' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i, \mathbf{Q}_i)}$ happen at exactly the same times τ_n we just need to count how many of them appear at any given time. For a given τ_n that number has the distribution of

$$\kappa = R^{\mathbf{Q}}(U_n/U_{n+1}) = R^{\mathbf{Q}}(e^{-\zeta_n/\alpha}).$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(T_i, P_i)}$ and therefore $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_{U_n}$ is a point process independent of the iid elements $\{\mathbf{Q}_i\}$ and since $e^{-\zeta_n/\alpha}$ has a Pareto distribution with tail index α , the claim follows. $\square$

Example 5.3. For an illustration of the previous theorem, consider again the moving average process of order 1 from Example 4.9, i.e.

$$X_t = Z_t + cZ_{t-1},$$

for a sequence of i.i.d. nonnegative random variables $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with regularly varying distribution and the tail index $\alpha > 0$. Assume further that $c > 1$. In this case, the sequence $\{Q_j\}$, as a random element in the space $\tilde{l}_0$, is equal to the deterministic sequence $\{\dots, 0, 1/c, 1, 0, \dots\}$. Intuitively speaking, in each cluster of extremely large values, there are exactly two successive extreme values with the second one c times larger than the

first. Therefore, each such cluster can give rise to at most 2 records. By straightforward calculations, the random variables κ_i from Theorem 5.2 have the following distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa_i = 2) = \mathbb{P}(1/Z \leq 1/c) = \mathbb{P}(Z \geq c) = \frac{1}{c^\alpha} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\kappa_i = 1) .$$

6 Lemmas

6.1 Metric on the space $\tilde{l}_0$

Let $(\mathbb{X}, d)$ be a metric space, we define the distance between $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and subset $B \subset \mathbb{X}$ by $d(x, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : y \in B\}$. Let $\sim$ be an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{X}$ and let $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ be the induced quotient space. Define a function $\tilde{d} : \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \times \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by:

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \inf\{d(x', y') : x' \in \tilde{x}, y' \in \tilde{y}\} ,$$

for all $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(\mathbb{X}, d)$ be a separable metric space. Assume that for all $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ and all $x, x' \in \tilde{x}$ we have*

$$d(x, \tilde{y}) = d(x', \tilde{y}). \tag{6.1}$$

Then $\tilde{d}$ is a pseudo-metric which makes $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ a separable and complete pseudo-metric space.

Proof. To prove that $\tilde{d}$ is a pseudo-metric, the only nontrivial step is to show that $\tilde{d}$ satisfies the triangle inequality, but that is implied by Condition (6.1). Separability is easy to check and it remains to prove that $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}, \tilde{d})$ is complete.

Let $\{\tilde{x}_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}, \tilde{d})$. Then we can find a strictly increasing sequence of nonnegative integers $\{n_k\}$ such that

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}_m, \tilde{x}_n) < \frac{1}{2^{k+1}},$$

for all integers $m, n \geq n_k$ and for every integer $k \geq 1$. We define a sequence of elements $\{y_n\}$ in $\mathbb{X}$ inductively as follows:

- Let y_1 be an arbitrary element of $\tilde{x}_{n_1}$.
- For $k \geq 1$ let y_{k+1} be an element of $\tilde{x}_{n_{k+1}}$ such that $d(y_k, y_{k+1}) < \frac{1}{2^{k+1}}$. Such an y_{k+1} exists by Condition (6.1).

Then the sequence $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbb{X}, d)$. Indeed, for every $k \geq 1$ and for all $m, n \geq k$ we have that

$$d(y_m, y_n) \leq \sum_{l=m \wedge n}^{m \vee n - 1} d(y_l, y_{l+1}) < \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{l+1}} = \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

Since $(\mathbb{X}, d)$ is complete, the sequence $\{y_n\}$ converges to some $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Let $\tilde{x}$ be the equivalence class of x . It follows that the sequence $\{\tilde{x}_{n_k}\}$ converges to $\tilde{x}$ because $\tilde{d}(\tilde{x}_{n_k}, \tilde{x}) \leq d(y_{n_k}, x)$ by definition of $\tilde{d}$. Finally, since $(\tilde{x}_n)$ is a Cauchy sequence, it follows easily that the whole sequence $(\tilde{x}_n)$ also converges to $\tilde{x}$, hence $(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}, \tilde{d})$ is complete. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Since we have $\|\theta^k \mathbf{x} - \theta^l \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} = \|\theta^{k-l} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty}$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in l_0$ and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, it follows that

$$\tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) = \inf\{\|\theta^k \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \inf\{\|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} : \mathbf{x}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\},$$

for all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \tilde{l}_0$, and all $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y} \in \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$. In view of Lemma 6.1 it only remains to show that $\tilde{d}$ is a metric, rather than just a pseudo-metric.

Assume that $\tilde{d}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) = 0$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \tilde{l}_0$. Then, for arbitrary $\mathbf{x} \in \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y} \in \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, there exists a sequence of integers $\{k_n\}$ such that $\|\theta^{k_n} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It suffices to show that the sequence $\{k_n\}$ is bounded. Indeed, by passing to a convergent subsequence it follows that there exists an integer k such that $\mathbf{y} = \theta^k \mathbf{x}$, hence $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$. Suppose now that the sequence $\{k_n\}$ is unbounded and that $\mathbf{y} \neq 0$ (the case when $\mathbf{y} = 0$ is trivial). Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\mathbf{y} \neq 0$ and $\lim_{|i| \rightarrow \infty} y_i = 0$, there exists integers i_0 and $N > 0$ such that $|y_{i_0}| = \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} > 0$ and $|y_i| < \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty}/4$ for $|i| \geq N$. Since $\|\theta^{k_n} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$ there exists an integer $n_0 > 0$ such that $\|\theta^{k_n} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} < \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty}/4$ for $n \geq n_0$. By our assumption, we can find an integer $n \geq n_0$ such that $k_n - k_{n_0} + i_0 \geq N$, and it follows that

$$\frac{3}{4}\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} < |(\theta^{k_n} \mathbf{x})_{i_0}| = |x_{k_n+i_0}| = |(\theta^{k_{n_0}} \mathbf{x})_{k_n-k_{n_0}+i_0}| < \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty},$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, the sequence $\{k_n\}$ is bounded. $\square$

6.2 Assumption 3.4 is a consequence of β -mixing

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that the sequence $\{X_j\}$ is β -mixing with coefficients $\{\beta_j, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Assume that there exists a sequence r_n satisfying Assumption 1.1 and a sequence ℓ_n such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_n}{r_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{r_n} \beta_{\ell_n} = 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Then Assumption 3.4 holds.

Proof. Write $X_{i,j}$ for $(X_i, \dots, X_j)$. Set $k_n = \lfloor n/r_n \rfloor$ and let $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n$ be the vector of length $k_n(r_n - \ell_n)$ which concatenates all the subvectors $X_{(j-1)r_n+1, jr_n-\ell_n}$, $j = 1, \dots, k_n$. Let $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n^*$ be the vector build with independent blocks $X_{(j-1)r_n+1, jr_n-\ell_n}^*$ which each have the same distribution has the corresponding original blocks $X_{(j-1)r_n+1, jr_n-\ell_n}$. Applying [Ebe84, Lemma 2] and (6.2), we obtain

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n^*)) \leq k_n \beta_{\ell_n} = o(1). \quad (6.3)$$

Set $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{n,i} = a_n^{-1} X_{(j-1)r_n+1, jr_n-\ell_n}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{n,i}^* = a_n^{-1} X_{(j-1)r_n+1, jr_n-\ell_n}^*$ and define the following point processes

$$\tilde{N}_n'' = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(i/k_n, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{n,i})}, \quad \tilde{N}_n^* = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(i/k_n, \mathbf{X}_{n,i}^*)}.$$

Let f be a nonnegative function defined on $[0, 1] \times \tilde{\ell}_0$. Since the exponential of a negative function is less than 1, by definition of the total variation distance, the bound (6.3) yields

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\tilde{N}_n''(f)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\tilde{N}_n^*(f)} \right] \right| \leq d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_n^*)) = o(1). \quad (6.4)$$

We must now check that the same limit holds with the full blocks instead of the truncated blocks. Under Assumption 1.1, we know by [BS09, Proposition 4.2] that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every sequence $\{\ell_n\}$ such that $\ell_n \bar{F}(a_n) \rightarrow 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell_n} X_i > \epsilon a_n)}{\ell_n \bar{F}(a_n)} = \theta \epsilon^{-\alpha}. \quad (6.5)$$

Then, applying (6.5) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell_n} |X_{jr_n-i+1}| > \epsilon a_n \right) &\leq k_n \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell_n} |X_i| > \epsilon a_n \right) \\ &= O(k_n \ell_n \bar{F}(a_n)) = O(\ell_n / r_n) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that f depends only on the components greater than ϵ in absolute value. Then $N_n''(f) = \tilde{N}_n''(f)$ unless at least one component at the end of one block is greater than ϵ . This yields

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[e^{-N_n''(f)}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\tilde{N}_n''(f)}] \right| \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k_n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq \ell_n} |X_{jr_n-i+1}| > \epsilon a_n \right) = o(1).$$

The same relation also holds for the independent blocks. Therefore, Assumption 3.4 holds. $\square$

6.3 On continuity of addition in E

The next lemma gives sufficient conditions for continuity of addition in the space $E([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that $\{x_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ and $x' = (x, S, \{I(t) : t \in S\})$ an element in E such that $x_n \rightarrow x'$ in E . Suppose also that $\{b_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ which converges uniformly to a continuous function b on $[0, 1]$. Then the sequence $\{x_n - b_n\}$ converges in E to an element $x' - b \in E$ defined by*

$$x' - b = (x - b, S, \{I(t) - b(t) : t \in S\}) .$$

Proof. Recall that, for compact subsets A, B in $\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$m(A, B) = \mu(A, B) \vee \mu(B, A)$$

where

$$\mu(A, B) = \sup_{x \in A} \|x - B\|_\infty$$

and

$$\|x - A\|_\infty = \inf_{y \in A} |x_1 - y_1| \vee |x_2 - y_2|.$$

By Whitt [Whi02, Theorem 15.5.1.] to show that $x_n - b_n \rightarrow x' - b$ in E , it suffices to prove that

$$\mu(\Gamma_{x_n - b_n}, \Gamma_{x' - b}) \rightarrow 0. \tag{6.6}$$

Take an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. Note that b is uniformly continuous so by the conditions of the lemma there exists $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (i) $|t - s| < \delta \Rightarrow |b(t) - b(s)| < \epsilon$,
- (ii) $m(x_n, x') < \delta$, for all $n \geq n_0$ and
- (iii) $|b_n(t) - b(t)| < \epsilon$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Also, since b is continuous, it easily follows that $|b_n(t) - b_n(t-)| \leq 2\epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Take $n \geq n_0$ and a point $(z, t) \in \Gamma_{x_n - b_n}$, i.e.

$$z \in [(x_n(t-) - b_n(t-)) \wedge (x_n(t) - b_n(t)), (x_n(t-) - b_n(t-)) \vee (x_n(t) - b_n(t))].$$

Since $|b_n(t) - b_n(t-)| \leq 2\epsilon$ there exists $z' \in [x_n(t-) \wedge x_n(t), x_n(t-) \vee x_n(t)]$ (i.e. $(z', t) \in \Gamma_{x_n}$), such that

$$|(z' - b_n(t)) - z| \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Next, since $m(x_n, x') < \delta$, there exists a point $(y, s) \in \Gamma_{x'}$ such that

$$|s - t| \vee |y - z'| < \delta.$$

Note that $(y - b(s), s) \in \Gamma_{x'-b}$ and by previous arguments

$$\begin{aligned} |(y - b(s)) - z| &= |(y - b(s)) - z \pm (z' - b_n(t)) \pm b(t)| \\ &\leq |y - z'| + |b(t) - b(s)| + |b_n(t) - b(t)| + |(z' - b_n(t)) - z| \\ &\leq \delta + \epsilon + \epsilon + 2\epsilon \\ &\leq 5\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Also, $|s - t| < \delta \leq \epsilon$. Hence, for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$\mu(\Gamma_{x_n - b_n}, \Gamma_{x' - b}) \leq 5\epsilon.$$

and since ϵ was arbitrary, (6.6) holds. $\square$

6.4 Two technical lemmas for partial sum convergence in E

Lemma 6.4. *Let Assumption 1.1 hold. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} n\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{X_1}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_1|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right) = \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon \leq y Q_j \leq 1\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. Write first

$$n\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_1}{a_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_1|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} a_n^{-1} X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_i|/a_n \leq 1\}} \right]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty x \mu_n(dx)$$

where μ_n is the Radon measure on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ defined by

$$\mu_n(\cdot) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(a_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_i|/a_n \leq 1\}} \in \cdot)}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)}$$

By Lemma 3.2 and the continuous mapping theorem, the measure μ_n converges vaguely on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ to the measure μ_ϵ defined by

$$\mu_\epsilon(\cdot) = \theta \int_\epsilon^\infty \mathbb{P}(y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < y |Q_j| \leq 1\}} \in \cdot) \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy.$$

The measure μ_ϵ is finite since $\mu_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}) \leq \theta \epsilon^{-\alpha}$. Set $J_n = \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} a_n^{-1} X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < |X_i|/a_n \leq 1\}}$. To prove (6.7), we only need to prove that

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|x| > A} |x| \mu_n(dx) = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} [|J_n| \mathbb{1}_{\{|J_n| > A\}}]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} = 0.$$

Fix $m \geq 1$. Then, by stationarity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E} [|J_n| \mathbb{1}_{\{|J_n| > A\}}]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} &\leq \frac{1}{r_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\epsilon < |X_i|/a_n; |J_n| > A)}{\mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=-m}^m \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < a_n^{-1}|X_j| \leq 1\}} > A; |X_0| > a_n \epsilon\right)}{\mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \leq |j| \leq r_n} |X_j| > a_n \epsilon; |X_0| > a_n \epsilon\right)}{\mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)}. \tag{6.8}
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1.1, for every fixed $\eta > 0$, we can choose m such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \leq |j| \leq r_n} |X_j| > a_n \epsilon \mid |X_0| > a_n \epsilon\right) \leq \eta.$$

For fixed m , the term in (6.8) is zero for A large enough and all n . Therefore,

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} [|J_n| \mathbb{1}_{\{|J_n| > A\}}]}{r_n \mathbb{P}(|X_0| > a_n)} \leq \eta.$$

□

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\alpha \in [1, 2)$ and let N'' be the Poisson point process on $[0, 1] \times \tilde{l}_0 \setminus \{\tilde{\mathbf{0}}\}$ defined in Theorem 3.5 and assume that $\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_j|)^\alpha] < \infty$. Then, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the process V_ϵ defined in (4.24) converges uniformly a.s. (possibly along a subsequence) to the α -stable Lévy process V defined in (4.8b).*

Proof. By Lemma 6.4 it follows that

$$\int_{\{x : \epsilon < |x| \leq 1\}} x \mu(dx) = \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon \leq y Q_j \leq 1\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy,$$

so we can represent V_ϵ defined in (4.24) as

$$V_\epsilon(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} s^\epsilon(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) - t\theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon \leq y Q_j \leq 1\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy.$$

Recall from Remark 4.7 that we can define $W = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j$, $W_i = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |Q_{i,j}|$ so that $\{W_i, i \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with the same distribution as W and $\mathbb{E}[W_i^\alpha] < \infty$ and that $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_{P_i W_i}$ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty]$ with intensity measure $\theta \mathbb{E}[W_1^\alpha] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy$. In particular, for every $\delta > 0$ there a.s. exists at most finitely many points $P_i W_i$ such that $P_i W_i > \delta$. For $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, define

$$m_{\epsilon, \delta} = \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < y |Q_j| \leq 1, \delta < y W \leq 1\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy.$$

Note that $m_{\epsilon,\delta}$ is well defined and that by bounded convergence, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} m_{\epsilon,\delta} = m_{0,\delta}$.

Since for every $\delta > 0$ there a.s. exists at most finitely many points $P_i W_i$ such that $P_i W_i > \delta$, for every $\epsilon \geq 0$ we can define the process $V_{\epsilon,\delta}$ in $D[0, 1]$ by

$$V_{\epsilon,\delta}(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} s^\epsilon(P_i \mathbf{Q}_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{\delta < P_i W_i \leq 1\}} - t m_{\epsilon,\delta}.$$

Note that $V_\epsilon = V_{\epsilon,0}$ and for every fixed $\delta > 0$, $V_{\epsilon,\delta}$ converges uniformly a.s. to $V_{0,\delta}$ which can be expressed as

$$V_{0,\delta}(t) = \sum_{T_i \leq t} P_i \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{\delta < P_i W_i \leq 1\}} - t m_{0,\delta} = \sum_{T_i \leq t} P_i W_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\delta < P_i W_i \leq 1\}} - t m_{0,\delta}.$$

We prove that $V_{0,\delta}$ converges almost surely uniformly to a process V in $D([0, 1])$. Note first that the finite dimensional distributions of $V_{0,\delta}$ converge to those of an α -stable Lévy process.

Since $\sum_{i \geq 1} \delta_{T_i, P_i, \mathbf{Q}_i}$ is a Poisson point process, the process $V_{0,\delta}$ has independent increments with respect to δ , that is for every $\delta < \delta'$, $V_{0,\delta'} - V_{0,\delta}$ is independent of $V_{0,\delta}$. Moreover, since $V_{0,\delta}$ is a Poisson integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(V_{0,\delta}(1) - V_{0,\delta'}(1)) &= \theta \int_0^\infty y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\delta y W \leq \delta'\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\ &\leq \theta \mathbb{E} \left[W^2 \int_0^{\delta'/W} \alpha y^{-\alpha+1} dy \right] = \frac{\theta \alpha (\delta')^{2-\alpha}}{(2-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}[W^\alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, arguing exactly as in the proof of [Res07, Proposition 5.7, Property 2] there exists a càdlàg version V of the limiting α -stable Lévy process such that $V_{0,\delta}$ converges almost surely uniformly to V .

There only remains to prove that for all $u > 0$,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\|V_{\epsilon,\delta} - V_\epsilon\|_\infty > u) = 0$$

Write $V_{\epsilon,\delta} - V_\epsilon = \tilde{V}_{\epsilon,\delta} + R_\delta$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{\epsilon,\delta}(t) &= \sum_{T_i \leq t} P_i \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < P_i |Q_{i,j}| \leq 1\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{P_i W_i \leq \delta\}} \\ &\quad - t \theta \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[y \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < y |Q_j| \leq 1\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{y W \leq \delta\}} \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy, \\ R_\delta(t) &= \sum_{T_i \leq t} P_i \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_{i,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{P_i |Q_{i,j}| > 1\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{P_i W_i \leq \delta\}}. \end{aligned}$$

The process R_δ does not depend on ϵ and almost surely there are finitely many points $(T_i, P_i, \mathbf{Q}_i)$ such that $P_i > 1$. Therefore, $\|R_\delta\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. The process $\tilde{V}_{\epsilon, \delta}$ is a càdlàg martingale, thus applying Doob-Meyer's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\tilde{V}_{\epsilon, \delta}\|_\infty > u\right) &\leq u^{-2} \text{var}(\tilde{V}_{\epsilon, \delta}(1)) \\ &= u^{-2} \theta \int_0^\infty y^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} Q_j \mathbb{1}_{\{\epsilon < y |Q_j| \leq 1\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{yW \leq \delta\}} \right)^2 \right] \alpha y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\ &\leq u^{-2} \theta \mathbb{E} \left[W^2 \int_0^{\delta/W} \alpha y^{-\alpha+1} dy \right] = \frac{\theta \alpha \delta^{2-\alpha}}{u^2 (2-\alpha)} \mathbb{E}[W^\alpha] . \end{aligned}$$

□

Acknowledgements

Parts of this paper were written when Bojan Basrak visited the Laboratoire MODAL'X at Université Paris Ouest Nanterre. Bojan Basrak takes pleasures in thanking MODAL'X and for excellent hospitality and financial support, as well as Johan Segers for useful discussions over the years. The work of Bojan Basrak and Hrvoje Planinić has been supported in part by Croatian Science Foundation under the project 3526. The work of Philippe Soulier was partially supported by LABEX MME-DII.

References

- [Arr98] Richard Arratia. On the central role of scale invariant Poisson processes on $(0, \infty)$. In *Microsurveys in discrete probability (Princeton, NJ, 1997)*, volume 41 of *DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, pages 21–41. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.
- [AT92] Florin Avram and Murad S. Taqqu. Weak convergence of sums of moving averages in the α -stable domain of attraction. *Ann. Probab.*, 20(1):483–503, 1992.
- [Bil68] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. New York, Wiley, 1968.
- [BK14] Bojan Basrak and Danijel Krizmanić. A limit theorem for moving averages in the α -stable domain of attraction. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(2):1070–1083, 2014.
- [BKS12] Bojan Basrak, Danijel Krizmanić, and Johan Segers. A functional limit theorem for dependent sequences with infinite variance stable limits. *The Annals of Probability*, 40(5):2008–2033, 2012.

- [Bra07] Richard C. Bradley. *Introduction to strong mixing conditions. Vol. 1*. Kendrick Press, Heber City, UT, 2007.
- [BS09] Bojan Basrak and Johan Segers. Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(4):1055–1080, 2009.
- [BT16] Bojan Basrak and Azra Tafro. A complete convergence theorem for stationary regularly varying multivariate time series. *Extremes*, 2016. Forthcoming.
- [DH95] Richard A. Davis and Tailen Hsing. Point process and partial sum convergence for weakly dependent random variables with infinite variance. *The Annals of Probability*, 23(2):879–917, 1995.
- [dHL01] Laurens de Haan and Tao Lin. On convergence toward an extreme value distribution in $C[0, 1]$. *The Annals of Probability*, 29(1):467–483, 2001.
- [DMZ08] Yuri Davydov, Ilya Molchanov, and Sergei Zuyev. Strictly stable distributions on convex cones. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 13:259–321, 2008.
- [DR85] Richard Davis and Sidney Resnick. Limit theory for moving averages of random variables with regularly varying tail probabilities. *The Annals of Probability*, 13(1):179–195, 1985.
- [DVJ03] Daryl J. Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. I*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2003. Elementary theory and methods.
- [DVJ08] Daryl J. Daley and David Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. II*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, New York, second edition, 2008. General theory and structure.
- [Ebe84] Ernst Eberlein. Weak convergence of partial sums of absolutely regular sequences. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 2(5):291–293, 1984.
- [HL05] Henrik Hult and Filip Lindskog. Extremal behavior of regularly varying stochastic processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 115(2):249 – 274, 2005.
- [HL06] Henrik Hult and Filip Lindskog. Regular variation for measures on metric spaces. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)*, 80(94):121–140, 2006.
- [HS08] Henrik Hult and Gennady Samorodnitsky. Tail probabilities for infinite series of regularly varying random vectors. *Bernoulli*, 14(3):838–864, 2008.
- [HS10] Henrik Hult and Gennady Samorodnitsky. Large deviations for point processes based on stationary sequences with heavy tails. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 47(1):1–40, 2010.

- [Kal83] Olav Kallenberg. *Random measures*. Akademie-Verlag, 1983.
- [MPU06] Florence Merlevède, Magda Peligrad, and Sergey Utev. Recent advances in invariance principles for stationary sequences. *Probab. Surv.*, 3:1–36, 2006.
- [MS10] Thomas Meinguet and Johan Segers. Regularly varying time series in banach spaces. arXiv:1001.3262, 2010.
- [MW13] Thomas Mikosch and Olivier Wintenberger. Precise large deviations for dependent regularly varying sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 156(3-4):851–887, 2013.
- [MW16] Thomas Mikosch and Olivier Wintenberger. A large deviations approach to limit theorem for heavy-tailed time series. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 2016.
- [Res87] Sidney I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Applied Probability, Vol. 4,. New York, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [Res07] Sidney I. Resnick. *Heavy-Tail Phenomena*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2007. Probabilistic and statistical modeling.
- [RS15] François Roueff and Philippe Soulier. Convergence to stable laws in the space D . *Journal of Applied Probability*, 52(1):1–17, 2015.
- [Whi02] Ward Whitt. *Stochastic-process limits*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.